UNITED NATIONS

E

Economic and Social Council

Distr.
GENERAL

E/C.12/1994/SR.4
10 May 1994

Original: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS

Tenth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 4th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 3 May 1994, at 3 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr. ALSTON

CONTENTS

Consideration of reports (continued)

(a) Reports submitted by States parties in accordance with articles 16 and 17 of the Covenant

Uruguay (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.94-16464 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS (agenda item 4) (continued)

(a) REPORTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLES 16 AND 17 OF THE COVENANT

Initial report of Uruguay (E/1990/5/Add.7; E/C.12/1993/WP.8)

1. Mrs. RIVERO (Uruguay), continuing her comments on issues related to article 6 of the Covenant, stated that there had been significant changes in the unemployment rate. Some 240,000 people were employed in the public sector and some 900,000 in the private sector. Unemployment stood at 110,000. For further statistics she referred the Committee to the annexes lodged with the Secretariat.

2. The CHAIRPERSON drew attention to the questions in the list of issues (E/C.12/1993/WP.8) relating to article 7, which were the following:

> "7. Can you provide statistical data showing how wage levels (minimum wages and average earnings) have changed by comparison with the cost of living?
>
> 8. What are the main measures (laws, regulations, court decisions, collective agreements) that have been taken to safeguard and promote the right to safe and healthy working conditions and to prevent occupational accidents?
>
> 9. Can you provide statistical information on the number, type and frequency of occupational accidents and cases of and trends in occupational illnesses?
>
> 10. What are the main laws, administrative regulations, collective agreements and court decisions that are designed to ensure equality of opportunity for promotion in employment and what problems have been encountered in this regard?"

3. Mrs. RIVERO (Uruguay) said that a national minimum wage existed, but it was not in widespread use, since most wages were based on collective agreements between employers and employees. She drew attention to the fact that there were separate minimum wages for rural wage-earners and for domestic workers. She referred the Committee to the annexes to the report which contained details on minimum wages in each sector as well as the provisions of Act No. 15,180 of August 1981, which determined the various entitlements to unemployment benefit.

4. Mr. TEXIER, noting that paragraph 55 of the report (E/1990/5/Add.7) outlined the history of Salary Boards since 1943, said that according to his information there had been no meetings of the Salary Boards since 1990. He asked whether that information was correct and, if so, how minimum wages were set: whether by the State or by the tripartite commission referred to

earlier. With regard to social protection, he said that Uruguay, which had previously had the best record in Latin America, had been adversely affected by the dictatorship between 1973 and 1984. He wanted to know more about the current position.

5. Mrs. RIVERO (Uruguay) said that the minimum wage applied only in the rare cases where there was no collective agreement. Strikes had occurred, but she stressed that the workforce had participated fully in negotiating agreements. The role of the Ministry of Labour had been to act as mediator; in an effort to do away with conflicts it had adopted a more active, positive stance. There had therefore been less need to call on the Salary Boards.

6. Mr. SIMMA reminded the representatives of Uruguay that articles 6 to 9 of the Covenant corresponded closely with the position of the International Labour Organization (ILO), which in 1993 had noted that wages in Uruguay were fixed unilaterally by the Government. In view of that, he saw some ambivalence in the Government's "more active stance". He also quoted the Uruguayan Association of Secondary School Teachers as stating in 1989 that teachers' wages were determined by the State. He asked, first, whether that was still the case and, secondly, how the wage of a primary school teacher with a wife and two children compared with the minimum wage of $95, which according to the country report provided a standard of living below the poverty line.

7. Mr. GRISSA pointed out that when inflation went as high as 90 per cent a year - average inflation in Uruguay over the previous four years had amounted to 85 per cent - it was a matter of vital importance how, and at what intervals, the minimum wage was adjusted.

8. Mrs. RIVERO (Uruguay) said that according to the official figures the current inflation rate was 40 per cent. As for teachers' salaries, she said that a teacher at a primary school earned about twice the minimum wage - some $200 - and at a secondary school more than that. With regard to the activities of the Ministry of Labour, she said that it acted as a third party, facilitating negotiations but not directly establishing wages. All the parties to negotiations contributed to determining wage levels and there was no question of the Government imposing its own decision.

9. Mr. GRISSA said that if adjustments to the minimum wage were made only once a year even the lower inflation rate of 40 per cent would mean that the purchasing power of the wage would decline by that same 40 per cent. He therefore wished to know how frequently such adjustments took place: annually, quarterly or at some other interval.

10. Mr. SIMMA expressed concern that because the Committee had a less specific mandate than, for example, the ILO, there was a danger that country delegations would not take enough care over their responses to the Committee's questions. The representatives of Uruguay had dealt too much in generalities. He therefore reiterated the question as to whether the Salary Boards had been in use since 1990 and as to how the delegation responded to the ILO findings on wages.

11. Mrs. RIVERO (Uruguay), replying to Mr. Grissa's question, said that the minimum wage was adjusted every four months. As for the assertions by the ILO, she did not know to what they referred. Her Government made a point of not having many regulations, not even restrictions on the right to strike. Such restrictions would naturally be more convenient for the Government, but the strength of the unions was such that there was no question of government impositions. Wages agreed by negotiation were invariably higher than the minimum: a result often achieved, indeed, thanks to the efforts of the Ministry of Labour negotiator.

12. Mr. TEXIER requested clarification of the statement in paragraph 87 of the report that "any dismissal connected with or caused by pregnancy is wrongful". He also asked for further information on measures to prevent accidents at work. He wondered whether inspectors were entitled to close a site they considered dangerous and indeed whether there were enough inspectors to carry out their duties adequately. Prevention of accidents was crucial. He further wished to know whether the incidence of occupational accidents was increasing or decreasing.

13. Mrs. RIVERO (Uruguay) said that the statement regarding dismissal connected with pregnancy was intended to show that Uruguay was making every effort to diminish discrimination against women at work. Article 37 of the Children's Code gave women dismissed on the grounds of pregnancy the opportunity of recourse to the courts, which increasingly pronounced in their favour. She added that in practice there was no discrimination in employment on the grounds of race, colour or sex.

14. Mr. CHABEN (Uruguay) said that Uruguay's record on accident prevention was very good. It had ratified over 70 ILO Conventions, particularly those concerned with health and safety; in addition, it had extensive domestic regulations which provided for substantial penalties in the event of non-compliance. There was also a system of on-the-spot fines for companies which did not comply with the prevailing standards. The strength of the Uruguayan approach lay in the fact that the country had both a strong trade union movement, which ensured that the Government maintained its vigilance on safety practices, and a long tradition of prosecuting those who transgressed the law.

15. Mr. CEAUSU noted that paragraph 71 of the report stated that persons under 15 but above 12 years of age were authorized to be employed in jobs which were not dangerous to life or harmful to health and morals, provided that such employment did not prejudice attendance at school or the capacity to benefit from instruction; yet paragraph 73 implied that children were permitted to work up to 12 hours a day. It was hard to believe that children could continue to study after such long hours of work. To add to the confusion, according to paragraph 74, the working day for apprentices and workers under 18 years of age was restricted to six hours a day. He sought clarification on the discrepancy.

16. Mrs. RIVERO (Uruguay) said that that had been an error of drafting. Children were not permitted to work more than 12 hours a week. Where they worked six hours in a day they were obliged to have a break. She added that adults who worked a six-hour day were entitled to a half-hour break, while those who worked eight hours were entitled to an hour's break.

17. The CHAIRPERSON drew attention to the issues to be taken up under article 8 of the Covenant. The issues were as follows:

> "11. The Uruguayan Constitution (art. 57) encourages the establishment of conciliation and arbitration tribunals. Have such tribunals been set up and how do they operate?
>
> 12. Has the bill to regulate the right to strike (para. 104 of the report) been submitted and, if so, what is its content?"

18. Mr. SIMMA asked for clarification of paragraph 107 of the report (E/1990/5/Add.7) which read: "As a result of legislative developments marked by steps forwards and steps backwards, some provisions of Act No. 13,720 of 16 December 1968, as amended by Decree-Law No. 14,781 of 8 June 1978, have survived". Did that legislation, adopted by the previous Uruguayan regime, cover the right to strike?

19. Mr. CHABEN (Uruguay) said that some vestiges of the legislation on the right to strike promulgated by the military Government (known as decree-laws, while the acts that the democratic Government adopted were known as decrees) remained in force, but they covered only essential services including air traffic control and health. The right to strike per se was maintained.

20. Mr. CEAUSU referred to paragraph 104 of the report in which it was stated that the Executive had announced that a bill to regulate the right to strike would be submitted shortly and inquired whether that had been done.

21. Mrs. RIVERO (Uruguay) replied that although a bill was before the Uruguayan Parliament, no action had yet been taken on it. For the time being, therefore, there was no regulation of the right to strike, with the exceptions mentioned by Mr. Chaben.

22. The CHAIRPERSON said that although there were no questions on article 9 in the list of issues, Mrs. Jimenez Butragueño had some questions on that article to put to the delegation of Uruguay.

23. Mrs. JIMENEZ BUTRAGUEÑO asked what the difference was between the ordinary retirement pension and the old-age retirement pension mentioned in paragraph 131 of the report. In connection with paragraph 132, she asked whether retirement at 60 was compulsory after 30 years' service; moreover, she was not clear about the benefit referred to in paragraph 135. What was the amount of the retirement pension granted to persons who had held high public office, referred to in paragraph 134? In paragraph 138 it was stated that the maximum amount of the pension was the equivalent of four times the national minimum wage. That seemed to indicate that a pensioner would receive more than someone in work, which was rather strange. In connection with the

different retirement age for men and women, she observed that it was not necessarily a privilege for women to retire earlier than men. Was it possible for a pensioner to continue an activity after retiring? Lastly, she asked for details of the benefit mentioned in paragraph 139.

24. Mrs. VYSOKAJOVA asked whether pensions were indexed, in view of the 40 per cent inflation rate.

25. Mrs. RIVERO (Uruguay) said that Uruguayan social security legislation was both advanced and very expensive. Plans were afoot to change it, but agreement was proving hard to reach.

26. Replying to specific questions by members of the Committee, she said that pensions were indeed indexed, every four months. On the question of women's retirement age, she explained that because working women had extra duties in the home they were free, although not obliged, to retire at 55. Since the report had been drafted the minimum retirement age had been raised to 60 for women and 65 for men. The ordinary retirement pension was paid to a person who had worked the requisite number of years and reached pensionable age. Retirement was then compulsory and, officially, pensioners were not allowed to take a job. The old-age retirement pension was paid to persons who had worked only 10 years but had reached retirement age. She was unable to say what the actual amounts were. Persons who had held high public positions did not have to have as many years of service to be eligible for their pension as workers to be eligible for the ordinary retirement pension. Certain public service posts were considered to be highly stressful and not paid nearly as well as similar work in the private sector, and that factor was taken into account in pension rights.

27. In reply to a point raised by Mrs. JIMENEZ BUTRAGUEÑO, Mr. CHABEN (Uruguay) said that it was unfortunately true that a high official would have a larger pension after 5 years' service than a worker after 30 years.

28. The imbalance of the social security system was a huge problem in Uruguay, where 500,000 persons out of a population of 3 million were inactive but with pensions indexed automatically every four months. That was a constitutional provision introduced after the referendum of 1990, and could not be changed, but the Government was trying to find ways of financing that huge outlay.

29. **The CHAIRPERSON** drew attention to the issue raised under article 10 of the Covenant, which read as follows:

> **"13. Do children of unmarried couples have the same rights as children of married couples (in particular, with regard to legal and social status, property rights, etc.)?"**

30. Mrs. RIVERO (Uruguay) said that her country's legislation granted full legal and social equality in all respects to natural children, making no differentiation between them and the children of married couples. To cite the case of property rights, Act No. 16,051 of 1989 had recently given either parent, rather than the father alone, authority over the property rights of any child under his or her patria potestas.

31. Mr. TEXIER asked whether the Government planned to pass legislation that would establish a single age of majority for civil purposes and for criminal purposes (paras. 163-165 of the report).

32. Mr. GRISSA said that he did not understand how the time-limits cited in paragraph 149 of the report as the criterion for recognition of conception in wedlock corresponded in any way to the real term of pregnancy, and wondered why those figures had been chosen.

33. Mr. CHABEN (Uruguay) said that the time-limits of 180 days after solemnization of a marriage or 300 days after dissolution of a marriage, as set in the Civil Code, were derived from the Roman law tradition through the Napoleonic Code and were considered time-limits that met the test of reasonableness.

34. Mrs. RIVERO (Uruguay) added that there was a legal presumption of legitimacy in the case of children so conceived, but that proof to the contrary could always be adduced to disclaim paternity.

35. Mrs. BONOAN-DANDAN observed that, although the report asserted full legal equality of legitimate and natural children, none the less, several paragraphs in the report dealt only with the rights of legitimate children and it was generally silent on the duties of the State towards natural children. Paragraph 147 (c) in particular stressed the responsibility of the parents, not the Government, towards children born out of wedlock. More should be said about natural children and their rights: did they, for instance, have the same inheritance rights? Paragraph 153 dealing with the "public status" of natural children was unclear, and she would also appreciate information on abandoned or runaway children, on whether there were any street children in Uruguay as there were in Brazil or the Philippines, the extent of that problem and what the Government was doing to deal with it.

36. Mrs. JIMENEZ BUTRAGUEÑO asked for clarification of the provision of the Civil Code (para. 151 of the report) establishing that natural children acquired legal status as such only when they were so acknowledged or declared. What was their status if they were not recognized by a parent? Also, she wondered if the use of the term "illegitimate" persisted in Uruguayan law.

37. The CHAIRPERSON pointed out that the report of Uruguay never used the outdated term "illegitimate"; the term had been used inappropriately in the Committee's list of issues.

38. Mrs. RIVERO (Uruguay) observed that Uruguay's legislation had evolved considerably: not only did it guarantee full equality for natural children, but it eliminated the older, discriminatory terminology distinguishing illegitimate from legitimate children. It was true, of course, that in practice a natural child might not always enjoy full legal and social equality.

39. In the case of abandoned children, the State made every effort to trace the parents and, if successful, required that their parental authority be recognized and exercised. Where the parents were unknown - as in the case of street children - there were Government programmes administered by the

National Institute for Minors and the Children's Council to care for the children and educate them. There were fortunately not many street children as such in Uruguay, although she could give no specific figures. The problem in her country was more one of neglected children from large families in straitened circumstances, who were left to their own devices and lived in precarious conditions. Like the abandoned children, they were often, on the recommendation of specialized social workers, placed in foster families subsidized by the State; and the Ministry of Education and Culture ran special schools and institutions where they were fed and educated.

40. Mr. GRISSA asked whether the rapid inflation in Uruguay and the resultant reduction in real family income compounded the problem, forcing children to beg.

41. Mrs. RIVERO (Uruguay) said that the phenomenon was more complex. A heavy rural-to-urban migration, rather than inflation per se, was at the root of the problem.

42. She agreed with Mrs. Bonoan-Dandan that paragraphs 151 and 152 of the report were not very clear. The question of acknowledgement of natural children referred only to recognition by the father in cases where the father was undeclared; the mother of a natural child was always known, for otherwise the child could not be classified as such. An unmarried father was free either to recognize his paternity or to disclaim it. However, under Uruguayan law a married man could not of his own accord recognize a child born out of wedlock: paternity in such cases had to be declared by a court, upon petition by the mother.

43. Mrs. VYSOKAJOVA asked whether maternity leave (para. 130 of the report) was the same for married, single or widowed mothers, and whether adoptive mothers received the same maternity leave for an adopted infant as did biological mothers.

44. Mrs. RIVERO (Uruguay) said that all biological mothers were entitled to the same maternity leave, because the right was based on family responsibility and not on civil status. Either parent could opt for maternity leave. Adoptive mothers did not receive maternity leave but a special time off which, however, was only for a period of a few days and not for a full six months.

45. The CHAIRPERSON drew attention to the list of issues under article 11 of the Covenant, reading as follows:

> "14. Is there a guaranteed minimum income in Uruguay? Minimum wage for workers in the public and private sectors; unemployment benefits; earnings of persons who do not receive either wages or unemployment benefits.
>
> 15. Act No. 14,219 of 4 July 1974 (para. 175 of the report) liberalized rents. Are there any provisions to guarantee less expensive housing for less privileged categories?

16. Can you provide data on the proportion of persons who are not decently housed or who are homeless and on the measures being taken to improve the situation?

17. According to the report, poor families account for 22.9 per cent of the total urban population. What measures are being taken to improve this situation, and in particular, to develop or reform existing agrarian systems in order to achieve the most effective development and utilization of natural resources?"

46. Mr. CHABEN (Uruguay) said that issue No. 14 had already been addressed. With regard to issue No. 15, there were various provisions governing low-cost housing. Decree-Law No. 14,219, the basic housing legislation, prohibited eviction of tenants who had occupied their housing prior to June 1974 and whose income fell below a set amount calculated in "readjustable units" (unidades reajustables), each unit being equivalent to US$ 13.8. Such tenants were to be enrolled in an emergency housing register and could be evicted only when the Mortgage Bank of Uruguay, which together with the Ministry of Housing, Regional Planning and the Environment, dealt with all housing issues, assigned them suitable permanent housing which was within their means.

47. Act No. 16,237 of 1992 had created the National Housing Fund to work in conjunction with the Ministry of Housing, set the price ranges for basic family units and established the rule that no more than 20 per cent of a person's income should be required for housing. Family units were ranked on a scale according to national minimum wage levels, and various solutions were prescribed for the group lowest on that scale: emergency solutions were to be found for those earning from 0 to 10 readjustable units; basic family housing was to be provided for those earning from 10 to 30 readjustable units, permanent, category-II low-cost housing for those earning from 30 to 45 readjustable units, and permanent low-cost housing for those earning from 45 to 60 readjustable units.

48. In response to issue No. 16, he said that the latest census indicated that of the 1 million housing units in Uruguay, 850,000 were occupied, 50,000 were on the market for sale or rent, and the remainder consisted of seasonal or temporary secondary housing. The total number of families in Uruguay was estimated at 900,000, and approximately 50,000 had no regular housing. In addition, approximately 30,000 housing units were in a poor condition (having been built 37 years earlier on the average) or were not equipped with any basic services. Thus, around 80,000 housing units needed to be renovated or constructed. Some 13,000 additional units would have to be built. It was expected that in the course of the first six months of the current year, the Mortgage Bank of Uruguay and the Ministry of Housing would make available 15,200 housing units in Montevideo and the interior of the country.

49. Mr. TEXIER observed that the report (para. 174) stated that the right to housing was guaranteed by the Constitution but also seemed to indicate that rents were determined by their market value (para. 175). Did the Government provide any protection for less privileged categories by setting rent controls? Very little information had been given in the report on evictions

and the reasons for them, the usual reasons being either non-payment of rent or expropriation by the State for public works or neighbourhood renovation. He would like to know what the Government did in cases of eviction.

50. Mr. SIMMA asked for clarification of paragraph 178 in particular with regard to the role of the Mortgage Bank of Uruguay as adjudicator in cases of eviction. He also asked whether the adjudication process was transparent and if there were judicial guarantees protecting tenants' interests.

51. Mr. CHABEN (Uruguay), replying to the question raised by Mr. Texier, said that the right to housing was enshrined in the Constitution. Rents were not set by the market. Instead, a mixed system was in operation with rents determined by supply and increases based on an index set by the State and revised quarterly. When rents were not controlled in Uruguay, evictions and expulsions had been prevalent. The State had then intervened, and at present, thanks to controlled rents and increases, the incidence of evictions and expulsions had declined considerably. Under the Constitution, when the State was responsible for evicting tenants, for example during clearance for work of cultural or historical importance, it was obliged both to rehouse and provide financial compensation to those affected. The criteria used by the Mortgage Bank of Uruguay as adjudicator in cases of eviction were clearly defined and the Bank played an important role as intermediary. Persons threatened with eviction entered their names on a register and would be provided with similar housing, with rents not exceeding 20 per cent of their income.

52. The Bank also acted as a savings bank. After two years of saving, requests could be made for housing in accommodation built by the Bank, corresponding to the person's income.

53. Mr. SIMMA noted that Uruguay afforded considerable protection to tenants. However, he was concerned that the rigorous legislation protecting them could act as a deterrent to property owners who in an effort to circumvent the law could be tempted to leave property vacant or to offer only furnished accommodation. He asked whether the law protecting tenants differentiated between furnished and unfurnished accommodation.

54. Mr. CHABEN (Uruguay) noted that there was little furnished accommodation on offer in Uruguay. In theory, the extensive legislation protecting tenants could deter owners from renting property although, in practice, that was not the case as it was not viable to leave accommodation vacant due to the high immovable property taxes.

55. Mr. ALVAREZ VITA drew attention to the fact that statistics quoted in Uruguay's written answers to the list of issues were vastly different from those in a report entitled Derechos Humanos en Uruguay published by the NGO Service, Peace and Justice in Latin America (SERPAJ) in 1992. The answers stated that 15,200 housing units would be made available in the first half of 1994, whereas the SERPAJ report said that 90 housing units were being built per month. The report went on to state that 26,000 families lived in accommodation made of scrap material, 5,500 in shanty towns and 79,000 in derelict houses. The replies to the list of issues painted a different

picture, estimating that only 30,000 housing units were in a poor condition or derelict. Furthermore, the SERPAJ report asserted that modest but decent housing would account for one fifth of a family's income for 25 years.

56. The second area of concern was the volume of empty housing in Uruguay and in Punta del Este in particular, a famous seaside resort where accommodation was used mainly in summer, but lay empty for the rest of the year. Furthermore, he asked why there were such extremes of housing types in Uruguay, ranging from the luxurious to the very poor.

57. Mr. CHABEN (Uruguay) said that he was unable to confirm or refute the validity of the statistics contained in the report by SERPAJ as he had no information as to their source or reliability. The figures quoted in the written replies to the list of issues were official figures, published and distributed by government bodies.

58. Mrs. RIVERO (Uruguay) said that Punta del Este was a scenic, popular and luxurious coastal resort with summer houses and weekend accommodation belonging to citizens of Uruguay and neighbouring countries. That was not an uncommon situation. There was however, a more stable and permanent resident population, although it was true to say that the resort was more densely populated at summertime.

59. Uruguay had many different kinds of accommodation and dwellings. Montevideo boasted many varieties, above all because of the fact that half the population of Uruguay was concentrated there. The large middle-class population of Uruguay accounted for the prevalence of medium-range, middle-class housing, although extremes of wealth and poverty were also reflected in the housing and accommodation available.

60. Efforts were being made to ensure that the population enjoyed decent housing, a living wage and access to amenities and recreation, including holidays. Although Punta del Este was luxurious, other more accessible resorts could be found.

61. Mr. SIMMA said that the SERPAJ report had stated that the average price of accommodation on the open market was more than three times higher than the national minimum wage, and that was excluding charges for electricity, water and other services.

62. In connection with the issues relating to article 7 of the Covenant, it had been stated that a married, primary school teacher with two children received approximately US$ 200 per month, twice the average minimum wage. However, in view of the high rents in Montevideo, in particular, as quoted in the SERPAJ report, how did teachers make ends meet?

63. Mr. CHABEN (Uruguay) said that US$ 200 was the starting salary for all public officials. Increments were then based on whether the official was married, the number of children and his or her length of service.

64. Prior to 1975, Uruguay had had a sizeable middle class and a generation accustomed to owning property. Although the majority of Uruguay's population belonged to that generation, the situation had been turned on its head somewhat and younger people were more accustomed to renting accommodation.

65. The CHAIRPERSON invited the delegation of Uruguay to reply to the issues raised in connection with article 12, which read:

> "18. What measures are being taken to increase the number of persons benefiting from medical care (50.5 per cent, according to the report)?
>
> 19. Can you provide comprehensive plans and describe specific measures taken to guarantee adequate health services, including adequate medical attention in the event of illness or accident, for all age groups and all other categories of the population, in particular in rural areas?"

66. Mrs. RIVERO (Uruguay) said that Uruguay had negotiated a loan contract with the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to develop agricultural systems and improve the lot of rural, low-income populations. Further negotiations were still under way. IFAD was contributing US$ 12 million and Uruguay US$ 8 million to the project.

67. Efforts were also being made to promote small and medium-sized enterprises to try and reverse the demographic drift towards urban areas in search of better conditions, higher wages and facilities rural areas were unable to provide. Cultural and educational programmes had, in recent years, been targeted at rural areas and universities set up outside Montevideo. Success thus far had been limited but other programmes were being prepared.

68. Mr. MARCHAN ROMERO said that Uruguay's initial report (E/1990/5/Add.7) did not make it clear if there were two systems of social security; group schemes and mutual benefits schemes. He requested clarification of whether the systems were the same or parallel, and if a person would, as a member of one scheme be automatically covered by the other.

69. Mr. CHABEN (Uruguay) explained that the two systems went hand in hand. Uruguay had an extensive hospital network where treatment was free, including a university teaching hospital. Private medicine was also available.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.